



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/674,577

09/29/2003

Sathyanarayana Nagendra Puttu

50325-0797

5403

29989

7590

10/30/2006

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 10/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/674,577

Applicant(s)

PUTTU ET AL.

Examiner

Charles E. Anya

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-88 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-88 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/26/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-88 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 23-44 and 67-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The current focus of the Patent Office in regard to statutory inventions under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is the claimed invention must produce a “**tangible result**”. Currently, results stored in a computer readable medium as defined in the Specification are tangible. Unless the Specification supports an embodiment where the computer readable medium is define as a “**wave**” (such as a carrier wave). In the event, the Specification defines a computer readable medium can be a “wave”, the Applicant should delete the embodiment or indicate the claimed invention is not claiming the embodiment of the “wave”. The following link on the World Wide Web is for the United States Patent And Trademark Office (USPTO) policy on 35 U.S.C. §101.

http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/guidelines101_20051026.pdf

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Art Unit: 2194

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. **Claims 3,17,25,39,60,69 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

The following terms lack antecedent basis:

- i. "SNMP MIB" on line 2 of claims 3,17,60,69 and 83 and line 3 of claims 25 and 39.

For the purpose of this office action the Examiner would change "SNMP MIB" to "SNMP MIB object".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. **Claims 1-4,7,9-12,14,16,17,19,21-26,29,31-34,36,38,39,41,43-48,51,53-56,58,60,61,63,65-70,73,75-78,80,82,83,85,87 and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,822,569 to McPartlan et al.**

6. As to claim 1, McPartlan teaches a method for verifying information on a managed device, comprising: receiving a management request containing one or more values comprising proposals for a correct value of a managed object of the managed device (S39 Col. 9 Ln. 40 – 45); determining whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the managed object (S40-S42 Col. 9 Ln. 42 – 61); and transmitting a notification message indicating whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the managed object (S43 Col. 9 Ln. 59 – 61).

7. As to claim 2, McPartlan teaches the method of Claim 1, wherein the management request is a SNMP request, and wherein the managed object is a SNMP MIB object (figure 10 "...Get-Next requests...object class..." Col. 9 Ln. 17 – 61).

8. As to claim 3, McPartlan teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the notification message identifies which one of the one or more values match the correct value of the SNMP MIB object (Col. 9 Ln. 64 – 67).

9. As to claim 4, McPartlan teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the SNMP request conforms to any of SNMP version 1, SNMP version 2, or SNMP version 3 (figure 10 "...Get and Get-Next requests..." Col. 9 Ln. 17 – 61).

Art Unit: 2194

10. As to claim 7, McPartlan teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the SNMP MIB object stores an attribute for a protocol other than SNMP (CMIP Col. 5 Ln. 8 – 31).

11. As to claim 9, McPartlan teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the determining step results in determining that none of the one or more values match the correct value of the SNMP MIB object (figure 10 Col. 9 Ln. 40 – 61), and wherein the transmitting step comprises transmitting a notification message that includes an error message that describes an encountered problem in determining whether the one or more values match the correct value of the SNMP MIB object (“...informed...S43” Col. 9 Ln. 59 – 61).

12. As to claim 10, McPartlan teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the notification message is transmitted using SNMP (Col. 9 Ln. 64 – 67).

13. As to claim 11, McParttan teaches a method as recited in Claim 2, wherein the SNMP request is an SNMP GET request (figure 10 “...Get and Get-Next requests...” Col. 9 Ln. 17 – 61).

14. As to claim 12, McPartlan teaches the method as recited in Claim 2, wherein the SNMP request is an SNMP GETNEXT request (figure 10 “...Get and Get-Next requests...” Col. 9 Ln. 17 – 61).

Art Unit: 2194

15. As to claim 14, McPartlan teaches the method as recited in Claim 2, wherein the transmitting step comprises the step of storing, in a specified MIB object of the managed device, a notification value indicating whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the SNMP MIB object (Col. 9 Ln. 64 – 67, Col. 10 Ln. 1 – 10).
16. As to claims 16,23,38,45,60,67 and 82, see the rejection of claim 1 above.
17. As to claims 17,25,39,47,61,69 and 83, see the rejection of claim 3 above.
18. As to claims 19,29,41,51,63,73 and 85, see the rejection of claim 7 above.
19. As to claims 21,31,43,65,75 and 87, see the rejection of claim 9 above.
20. As to claims 22,36,44,53,58,66,80 and 88, see the rejection of claim 14 above.
21. As to claims 24,46 and 68, see the rejection of claim 2 above.
22. As to claims 26,48, and 70, see the rejection of claim 4 above.
23. As to claim 32,54 and 76, see the rejection of claim of claim 10 above.
24. As to claim 33,55 and 77, see the rejection of claim 11 above.

25. As to claim 34,56 and 78, see the rejection of claim 12 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

26. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

27. **Claims 5,27,49 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,822,569 to McPartlan et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,324,646 B1 to Chen et al.**

28. As to claim 5, McPartlan teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the one or more values are stored in the SNMP request in a VarBind portion.

Chen teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the one or more values are stored in the SNMP request in a VarBind portion (figure 2 Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 5, Col. 6 Ln. 44 - 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of McPartlan with the teaching of Chen because the teaching of Chen would improve the system of McPartlan by providing a process and system for protecting confidential data the may be retrieved from databases within a computer network (Chen Col. 2 Ln. 48 – 51).

29. As to claims 27,49 and 71, see the rejection of claim 5 above.

30. Claims 6,18,28,40,50,62,72 and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,822,569 to McPartlan et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,954,797 to Sidey.

31. As to claim 6, McPartlan is silent the method of Claim 2, wherein a specification for the SNMP MIB object is not generally available.

Sidey teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein a specification for the SNMP MIB object is not generally available (Col. 6 Ln. 9 – 21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of McPartlan with the teaching of Chen because the teaching of Chen would improve the system of McPartlan by allowing for the manual entry of MIB data to supplement and complement automatic collectable MIB data (Sidey Col. 6 Ln. 18 – 21).

32. As to claims 18,28,40,50,62,72 and 84, see the rejection of claim 6 above.

33. Claims 8,20,30,42,52,64,74 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,822,569 to McPartlan et al. in view of

WhitePaper: IronShield Best Practices Hardening Foundry Routers & Switches to Kwan.

34. As to claim 8, McPartlan is silent with reference to the method of Claim 2, wherein the SNMP MIB object stores a username or a password for one member of the following group consisting of: a telnet protocol, a SSH protocol, a TFTP protocol, a RCP protocol, a SNMP protocol, a TACACS protocol, and a RADIUS protocol.

Kwan teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the SNMP MIB object stores a username or a password for one member of the following group consisting of: a telnet protocol, a SSH protocol, a TFTP protocol, a RCP protocol, a SNMP protocol, a TACACS protocol, and a RADIUS protocol (pages 16,23,27,28,31,34,36,37,41,44,45,50,53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of McPartlan with the teaching of Kwan because the teaching of Kwan would improve the system of McPartlan by providing basic access security so as to protect devices against unauthorized access and usage (page 14).

35. As to claim 20,30,42,52,64,74 and 86, see the rejection of claim 8 above.

Art Unit: 2194

36. Claims 13,35,57 and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,822,569 to McPartlan et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,363,421 B2 to Barker et al.

37. As to claim 13, McPartlan is silent with reference to the method as recited in Claim 2, wherein the SNMP request is an SNMP GETBULK request.

Barker teaches the method as recited in Claim 2, wherein the SNMP request is an SNMP GETBULK request (GETBULK Col. 32 Ln. 54 – 67, Col. 33 Ln. 8 – 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of McPartlan with the teaching of Barker because the teaching of Barker would improve the system of McPartlan by providing a process for retrieving voluminous data from a large table.

38. As to claims 35,57 and 79, see the rejection of claim 13 above.

39. Claims 15,37,59 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,822,569 to McPartlan et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No. 20030131096 A1 to Goringe et al.

40. As to claim 15, McPartlan is silent with reference to the method of Claim 2, wherein the SNMP MIB object stores information about a prompt.

Art Unit: 2194

Goringe teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the SNMP MIB object stores information about a prompt ("...prompt..." page 1 paragraph 0004).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of McPartlan with the teaching of Goringe because the teaching of Goringe would improve the system of McPartlan by providing a process for enter commands through the Telnet program that will be executed as if there were been entered directly on a server console.

41. As to claims 37,59 and 81, see the rejection of claim 15 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E. Anya whose telephone number is (571) 272-3757. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:00).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2194

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Charles E Anya
Examiner
Art Unit 2194

cea.


MENG LI WANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ELECTRONIC BUSINESS CENTER 2194